UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

*Official Records*

CORRIGENDUM

Supplement No.25
(A/48/25)
20 January 1994

NEW YORK

# REPORT OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

(Seventeenth session)

Corrigendum

Chapter III

Replace paragraphs 42 to 57 with the attached.

94-03425 (E) 200194

200194

A/48/25/Corr.1
ENGLISH ONLY

## CHAPTER III

## ADOPTION OF DECISIONS 3/

Cooperation and linkages between the United Nations Environment Programme and other relevant United Nations bodies (decision 17/1)

42. At the 10th meeting of the seventeenth session, on 21 May 1993, the Governing Council had before it a draft decision on this subject submitted by the Vice-President of the Council, Chairman of the informal negotiating group (UNEP/GC.17/L.22/Add.1, draft decision 2).

43. The representative of India, supported by several other delegations, proposed that the word "staff" and the phrase "through secondment and other appropriate means" should be deleted from paragraph 3 of the draft, in order to ensure that there was no weakening of UNEP headquarters. After a lengthy discussion in which a number of representatives took part, the proposed amendment was withdrawn.

44. The draft decision was adopted by consensus.

45. Speaking in explanation of position after the adoption of the decision, the representative of India said that he had withdrawn his amendment on the understanding that the text was not intended to weaken UNEP headquarters.

46. The representative of Denmark, speaking on behalf of States members of the European Community that are members of the Council, said that the understanding of those States was the same as that of India. Effective UNEP participation in the follow-up to the Rio de Janeiro Conference was not intended to weaken the Nairobi headquarters.

47. The representative of the United States said that he wished to echo the statement made by the representative of Denmark. The intent of the decision was entirely to strengthen, not weaken UNEP. The Commission on Sustainable Development and the Global Environment Facility were established facts and would play key roles in the future actions to follow up the Rio de Janeiro Conference. His delegation held that UNEP's coordination with these two institutions, including their secretariats, had to be close and active. If not, UNEP could be marginalized and therefore weakened rather than strengthened. His delegation believed that all the representatives who had spoken in favour of the proposed amendment had, like his own, been motivated by the desire to strengthen UNEP - and he expressed the hope that the decision would be understood and accepted in that spirit.

48. The representative of Kenya said that his delegation understood that the decision would not mean a weakening of UNEP headquarters.

Additional proposed follow-up actions to resolutions adopted by the General Assembly related to the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (decision 17/2)

49. Also at the 10th meeting of the session, the Council had before it a draft decision on this subject submitted by the Vice-President of the Council, Chairman of the informal negotiating group (UNEP/GC.17/L.22/Add.1, draft decision 3).

50. The draft decision was adopted by consensus.

Annual reports of the Executive Director (decision 17/3)

51. At the same meeting, the Council had before it a draft decision on this subject submitted by the Vice-President of the Council, Chairman of the informal negotiating group (UNEP/GC.17/L.22), prepared on the basis of an earlier draft on the same subject submitted by the Committee of Permanent Representatives (UNEP/GC.17/L.4, annex).

52. The draft decision was adopted by consensus.

The United Nations Environment Programme and the role of women in environment and development (decision 17/4)

53. At the same meeting, the Council had before it a draft decision on this subject submitted by Austria, Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Italy, Kenya, Nigeria, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and Zimbabwe (UNEP/GC.17/L.18/Rev.1).

54. The draft decision was adopted by consensus.

Application of environmental norms by military establishments (decision 17/5)

55. At the same meeting, the Council had before it a draft decision on this subject, submitted by Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden (UNEP/GC.17/L.19/Rev.1).

56. The draft decision was adopted by consensus.

57. The representative of the United States of America, speaking in explanation of position after the adoption of the decision, said that his delegation, in a spirit of harmony, had chosen not to obstruct agreement on the decision. However, it did wish to dissociate itself from the consensus, for three reasons. First, it believed that UNEP did not have the expertise to deal with military issues. Second, the decision went beyond paragraph 20.22 of Agenda 21: countries should report to the Commission on Sustainable Development, and not to UNEP, on activities related to the overall follow-up to the Rio de Janeiro Conference. Third, his delegation believed that UNEP did not have the resources to become involved in another area that could involve significant demands in terms of both time and staff.

---